

Table 2.4 [Part 1] Stock welfare

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
who is stock owner	grazier/ Commoner	warden's wife!	C - NT + local farmer P - NT + local owner	local person	Commoners	Heathland Project	Commoner	Heathland Project
who inspects stock	grazier / Commoner	warden's wife!	C - as above P - as above	local person	Commoners	Heathland Project	Commoner	Heathland Project
is a stockman employed [days]	yes [part of every day]	no	no	no	no	Project staff	no	yes, [2]
do conservation staff do stock work [days]	no	yes, on occasion	no	no [done by owner]	no	yes [20] Project staff	no	yes, [8]
Frequency of tasks:			done by owners	done by owner				
worming	left to stock owners	once before turn out [+ ticks]			S - 1 C - 3 P - 1	1	1	1
fly treatments	[see above]	no			S - 1 C - 2 P - 1	1	no	no
foot treatments	[see above]	n/a			S - 1 C - n/a P - 1	occasionally	1	3 times
dagging	n/a	n/a			S - 1 C - n/a P - n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
dipping	n/a	n/a			S - 1 C - n/a P - n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
penned / corralled	left to stock owners	at turn-out and turn-off.			S - 1 C - 1-in at night P - 1	2	2+	not needed - trained to head collars
other								

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.4 [part 2] Stock welfare

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Uppgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
who is stock owner	Commoner	Suffolk Wildlife Trust - Sandlings Project.	Suffolk Wildlife Trust - Sandlings Project	local farmer	two local farmers	Norfolk Wildlife Trust	grazier	C - cattle dealer P - hobby owner
who inspects stock	Commoner	SWT's shepherd + other staff + vols.	SWT's shepherd + other staff + vols.	grazier	grazier	NWT's shepherdess	grazier & Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	conservation staff & owner
is a stockman employed [days]	no	yes (part time+ other staff time).	yes (part time+ other staff time).	no	no	no	no	no
do conservation staff do stock work [days]	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes [24 ]
Frequency of tasks:	not handled unless individual animal needs it							
worming	[see above]	every 8 weeks	every 8 weeks	1	3	2 to 3	2	C - 0 P - 0
fly treatments	[see above]	as needed up to every 6 weeks	as needed up to every 6 weeks	as needed	4	3 to 4	2	C - 0 P - 0
foot treatments	[see above]	2	2	1 to 2	3 to 4	6	1	C - n/a P - 0
dagging	[see above]	yes	yes	2	as needed	1 to 2	no	
dipping	[see above]	0		0 [no longer compulsory]	1	0	no	
penned / corralled	[see above]	9	9	4 to 5	c 10	6	c10	C - 1 P - 1
other	-	moved off site x 2; Heptovac injection x 2.	moving on / off site x 2; Heptovac injection x 2.			treatment of 3 lambs with pneumonia		

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.5 [Part 1] Stock management objectives

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The new forest	Brookwood heath	The flashes, frensham	Prey heath
<b>STOCK MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES</b>								
as stores	yes				C - yes	yes	yes	
fattening / finishing	yes		C - yes			yes	yes [with back-up land]	
flushing	n/a					n/a	n/a	
tupping / bulling / siring							yes	
overwinter holding site							yes	
conservation tool only		yes				yes		yes
rearing / growing on	C - yes P - yes	yes	C - yes P - yes	yes, to sell	P - yes	yes	yes	
<b>Do the animals:</b>								
lose weight							yes overwinter	
put on weight	yes, in summer	0.68 - 0.71 kg daily.	C - yes			perhaps a little	yes over summer	? yes
give a financial return	C - yes P - yes		?		S - yes [to collect premiums]	perhaps a little	yes [minimal]	no
how well were objectives met in the last grazing year.	sold well	100% conservation; 64% weight gain.	C - 80% P - 90%	80%		80%	30%	80% [needed to move to other site so lost a bit of grazing]
was this acceptable	yes	yes	C - yes; P - yes			yes	no	yes

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.5 [Part 2] Stock management objectives

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Upgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
<b>STOCK MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES</b>								
as stores	cattle yes			yes	yes			
fattening / finishing	sheep/ cattle yes					yes		
flushing	n/a							
tupping / bulling / siring	cattle yes							
overwinter holding site	not since 1991 for cattle							
conservation tool only		yes [mainly]	yes [mainly]			yes		
rearing / growing on	sheep yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		C - yes P - yes
Other							Pedigree breeding	
<b>Do the animals:</b>								
lose weight		ewes yes (but have followers at foot)	ewes yes (but have followers at foot)				= [+ fed lambs]	
put on weight	sheep & cattle yes	lambs + 20 kg	lambs	yes	yes		lambs yes	C - yes P - lost weight [not moor bred]
give a financial return	?	yes (but net loss due to staff & management costs)	yes (but net loss due to staff & management costs)	not known	not known		some	C - ? n/a
how well were objectives met in last grazing year?		70%	85%	80%	90%		100%	C - excellent P - poor
was this acceptable	sheep yes cattle yes	yes, but always aiming to improve	yes	yes	yes		yes	C - yes P - no [need moor bred animals]

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.6 [Part 1] Conservation management objectives & % satisfaction

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
Conservation Management Objectives [& % satisfaction]					This is a working forest so any entries below would be misleading.			
control succession			C - yes, 60% P - yes, 60%	30% [bog myrtle unpalatable]		yes	20%	90% grass 20% trees
control tree and shrub saplings [+ species]	C - yes, willow [50%]	100%, pine, birch, oak, willow.	C - yes, birch 60% P - yes, birch 60%	60% birch		20% pine 40% over 1 yr birch 50% up to 1 yr birch	10% pine 30% birch	5% birch 10% oak
maintain vegetation structure	C - yes [75%] P - yes [25% only; (grazing period too long so overgrazed)]	yes, 100%		60%			50%	30% little grazing of heather
improve vegetation structure	C - yes [75%] P - yes, 25% only, (grazing period too long so overgrazed)]	yes, 100%	C - yes, 80% P - yes, 80%	70%		40%	50%	50% [of grass]
develop vegetation mosaic	C - yes [75%] P - yes, 25% only, (grazing period too long so overgrazed)]	yes, 100%	C - yes, 75% P - yes, 75%	60%		60%	50%	50% [of grass]
increase bare ground for botany and invertebrates	C - yes [80% both] P - yes [90% both]	botany 100%, inverts 50 to 100%.	C - botany 70% P - botany 70%	botany 20%, inverts 20%		botany 40% inverts 40%	botany 50% inverts 50%	50%
control of grass invasion	C - yes [80% <i>Molinia</i> ] P - yes [90% <i>Molinia</i> ]	yes, 100%	C - yes, 80% P - yes, 80%			80%	80%	100%
control bracken	n/a	yes, 100% [ but ? <i>Viola</i> sp].				?	10%	n/a [stock do graze it on other sites]
reduce fire risk	C - yes [10%]	yes, % depends on NVC type		yes by 10%		?	30%	50%
single [rare] species management	n/a	100% pioneers of wet heath; 80% <i>Coenagrion mercuriale</i> .		60% for Wartbiter-cricket.			Natterjack 50%	
other reasons								80% [easy to manage]

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.6 [Part 2] Conservation management objectives & % satisfaction

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Ugate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
Conservation Management Objectives & % satisfaction.								
control succession	sheep yes	50%	60%	100%	100%		100%	C - 30% P - 25%
control tree and shrub saplings [+ species]	sheep & cattle yes on birch & oak [100 - 80%]	pine 50% birch 50%	pine 60% birch 60%	birch 100%	pine 100% birch 100% oak 100% hawthorn 100%	birch 90% others 90%	pine 70% birch 100% [only up to 1 metre]	pine C - 0% P - 25% birch C - 15% P - 0% oak C - 5% P - 0%
maintain vegetation structure	sheep & cattle yes [100 - 80% %]			75%				
improve vegetation structure	sheep & cattle yes [60 - 80%]	50%	70%		75%	50%	yes	C - 50% P - 50%
develop vegetation mosaic	sheep & cattle yes [80 - 80%]. Cattle good at breaking <i>Molinia</i> clumps & creating open water bogs.	yes	yes		75%		yes	C - 50% P - 50%
increase bare ground for botany and invertebrates	cattle yes [80%]	yes	yes	inverts - 90%		botany 50% inverts 100%		botany - C - 10% P - 10%
control of grass invasion		no (overgrazing encourages grass)	no (overgrazing encourages grass)			75%	25%	C - 75% P - 50%
control bracken	sheep & cattle yes [0%]	yes - 10% or less	yes - 10% or less					
reduce fire risk		yes	yes					
single [rare] species management		yes - Woodlark	yes - Woodlark	Stone Curlew / Wheatear / Woodlark 90%	Stone curlew 50%			
other reasons		20% - as an example to other local heath owners						

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.7 [Part 1] Monitoring of conservation objectives

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
Monitoring of Conservation Objectives								
control succession	a,b,c, remote sensing	h,c	a,c	a,b	a,k	a,b,c	a,b,c,h,	a,b,
control trees / shrubs	a,b,c	h,c	a,c	a,c	a,k	a,b,c	a,b,c,h,	a,b,
maintain vegetation structure	a,b,c + quadrats	h		a,j	a,b,j,k	a,b,c	a,b,c,h	a,b
improved vegetation structure	a,b,c,+ quadrats	h	c,d,j	a,j	a,d,g,h	a,b,c	a,b,c,h	a,b
development of vegetation mosaic	a,b,c,+ quadrats	a	c,d,j	a	a,d,h	a,b,c	a,b,c,h	a,b
increase in bare ground	a,c	h	d,j	a	c	a	a,b,c,h	
control of grass [invasion]		h	a,c,j			a	a,b,c,h	
control of bracken.	n/a	a,c			c	a	a	
reduced fire risk	number of fires	a		a,			a	
rare species management	spot counts	?	e,g	a,b,g,			a	
other	GIS	NVC 1989; ITE responses to management 1994+.					exclosures within grazed area	

Key: a - assessed by eye; b - photographs (casual); c - photographs (fixed point); d - botanical transects; e - butterfly transects; f - dragonfly transects; g - invertebrate transects; h - botanical quadrats; i) - sampling; j - vegetation height measurement; k - other qualitative method; l - other quantitative method; m - event recording / PPRS / CMS.

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.7 [Part 2] Monitoring of conservation objectives

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Uppgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
Monitoring of Conservation Objectives								
control succession		d, h, a, m	d, h, a	a, b	a, b		a	c
control trees / shrubs	a	d, h, a, m	d, h, a	a, b	a, b	a, b	a	c
maintain vegetation structure	a, h			a			a	
improved vegetation structure	a, h	d, h, a	d, h, a		a	a, j	a	c
development of vegetation mosaic	a, h				a		a	c
increase in bare ground	a, h			a, b		a, b	a	c
control of grass [invasion]						a,	a	c
control of bracken.	a	d, h, m [tractor managed]						
reduced fire risk		a	a					
rare species management	a	l	l	a, + annual census	a			
other								

Key: a - assessed by eye; b - photographs (casual); c - photographs (fixed point); d - botanical transects; e - butterfly transects; f - dragonfly transects; g - invertebrate transects; h - botanical quadrats; i) - sampling; j - vegetation height measurement; k - other qualitative method; l - other quantitative method; m - event recording / PPRS / CMS.

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.



Table 2.8 [Part 1] Finances - initial cost

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
Initial Finance Costs [£k] for:								
tree clearance	1.4k/ha	1.0k/ha						1.0 k
scrub clearance	1.4k/ha					3.0 k	1.0 k /ha	0.5 k
sapling clearance		[by cattle]				3.0 k		0.5 k
flailing / mowing	0.2k/ha					0.2 k	0.5 k firebreaks	
fencing		0.25k/km [single strand electric].	C & P - cattle grids £65k	0.5k [3 strand barb wire].		6.5 k	1.8 k [ electric; 3km long; £0.4/m]	0.3 k [electric]
corrals		0.25k				0.7 k		
stock trailers								
water supply		[stream water]				1.0 k		
4 x 4 vehicle or tractor								
footpath diversion						kissing gates [in fencing costs]		
other equipment		borrow weigh-crush.						
purchase of stock						1.0 k		0.335 k
feed racks							0.2 k	
other	hard standing for winter feed - 0.6k . Tracks - 0.5k.	1.0k/ha to burn tussock Molinia.						

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.8 [Part 2] Finances - initial costs

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Upgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith common [2]
Initial Finance Costs [£k]:								
tree clearance	-	0						7.906k [0.575k / ha for clearing ground after felling]
scrub clearance	1.0k/ha [Tot 6.0k]	5.0k	3.0k			4.5k	volunteers	
sapling clearance	-							0.76k [0.117k / ha for flailing stumps]
flailing / mowing	-	0.5k			10.0k [over 10 years]			
fencing	£1.5/m stock wire. [Total 6.0K]	2.0k [50p/m permanent electric]	5.0k [permanent]	3.0k stock fencing	8.0k [stock type; over 10 years]	1.0k [permanent portable; over 10 years]	1.2k permanent [£1/m] 0.6k portable [£0.5/m] [YTS Scheme]	4.255k permanent static [£3.7/m] 2.594k permanent portable [Ridley Rappa] £2.16 / m]
corrals	-	0.2k	0.1k			0.1k	0.4k	1.026k cattle pen
stock trailers	-	1.5k				1.2k	1.0k	
water supply	-	0.5k			6.0k	[carried in daily]		
4 x 4 vehicle or tractor		5.0k / 12k (tractor)				2.0k	4.0k	
footpath diversion	-							
other equipment	8 gates [Tot - 0.8k]	0.5k				0.1k		
purchase of stock	?	4.0k				0.5k [now breed own]	0.6k	
feed racks	-							
other		spraying bracken 4.0k	spraying bracken - 5.0k Commons legalities - 1.7k			Part of: travel costs - 2.0k trailer purchase & maintenance costs - 0.28k	portable sheep handling equipment - 1.0k  NB All above costs to grazier except fencing.	Insurance - 0.436k for stock and electric fencing.

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.9 [Part 1] Finances - annual costs

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
Annual Costs [£K]								
replacement of livestock						?		
feed costs of silage / hay								
dietary supplements of straw, mineral /vitamin / roughage licks		0.14k for 0.5 tonne nuts.				0.03k for minerals	0.3k for straw 0.05k for licks 0.2k for rolled barley	0.01k for licks
veterinary products		0.01k/animal				0.1k	0.03k	0.06k hoof trim [£12/animal]
fence repairs / replacements		0.01k/yr						yes [electric tape]
water meterage						?		
stockman costs		not charged [part of reserve duties; 1-2 hrs daily].						0.5k [?]
equipment repairs / servicing						?		
other		0.9k/yr to grazier for non-performance of stock.	WES payments to NT annually of £12k	1.0k scrub clearance				

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.9 [Part 2] Finances - annual costs

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham heath	Swannington Upgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
Annual Costs (£K)	[born by commoner]							
replacement of livestock		0				0	[home bred]	
feed costs of silage / hay		0.8k turnips, beet, nuts.	0.2k silage			0.01k hay	0.02k hay	
dietary supplements of straw, mineral /vitamin / roughage licks		n/a				0.04k ewe nuts for lambing time 0.004k licks	0.05k cake 0.01k minerals	
veterinary products		0.9k	0.2k			0.1k	0.05k	
fence repairs / replacements		0.1k	0.1k	0.5k	1.0k	0.02k	0.05k	0.05k way leave + electricity
water meterage		n/a						
stockman costs		equivalent agricultural wages	equivalent agricultural wages			0.014k		0.634k for transport of stock [ £50/head for cattle; £42/head for ponies].
equipment repairs / servicing		0.9k	0.2k	0.2k	0.2k	0.5k [LR repairs]	0.6k	
other		0.8k - transport of flying flock. 1.8k - admin	0.2k - travel 0.5k - admin				1.0k travel	0.114k for cutting vegetation under electric fence

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.10 [Part 1] Finances - average annual income or receipts

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
Average annual income or receipts [£K].								
livestock sales - young of the year		none				0.15k	[young are kept on]	
livestock sales - culls		none				none		
livestock - annual replacements		none				0.15k /yr		
grazing licence receipts		0.02k/yr as grass let.				none		
animal products		none				none		
other						none		

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. ε - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.10 [Part 2] Finances - average annual income or receipts

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Uppgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
Average annual income or receipts [£k].	[accrue to commoner]						[* bracketed figures relevant to whole flock, not just Skipwith].	
livestock sales - young of the year		3.6k	1k				[1.2k]	
livestock sales - culls		0.1k	0			0.04k	[0.2k]	
livestock - annual replacements		n/a	0					
grazing licence receipts		n/a	0	0.5k / annum	1.5k / annum		[1.0k]	
animal products		0.5k	0			0.01k	nil	
other		0.75k lambing fair 1.4k sponsor. 2.0k CoCo Stewardship	0			part of ESA payments of 5.5k		

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.11 [Part 1] Finances - sources of funds

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
Source[s] of funds [£k]:								
livestock receipts		0.02k				yes		
other grazing projects								
organisation funds	yes	yes [start up costs].		English Nature NNR funds.		yes [start up]	yes [0.12k start-up]	yes [start-up & annual running]
S 15 Agreement	yes							
WES payments			yes, £12k / year					
ESA payments								
CSS payments		yes				yes		
RES payments								
LHP grant						yes		
CC grant funds		yes, before 1994.				yes		
other	'special beef premium' [under LFA payments]			Species Recovery Project		Borough Council funding	0.673k Species Recovery Programme  Running costs met by grazier	Borough Council [start up]

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.11 [Part 2] Finances - sources of funds

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Upgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
Source[s] of funds [£k]:								
livestock receipts		yes	yes			yes	yes [£0.67k]	
other grazing projects						yes	yes [shared with Applethorpe Common, Spurn Point]	
organisation funds	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	sponsorship from NW Trust members		
S 15 Agreement								
WES payments							1.0k for Skipwith	yes
ESA payments						part of 5.5k		
CSS payments		yes	yes			yes [ but not for sheep flock]		
RES payments								
LHP grant		yes	yes			yes		
County Council grant funds		yes	yes					
other	EN grant	District Council. Local freebies / cheap supplies of feed & bedding.	District Councils	grazing licence	grazing licence			

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.



Table 2.12 [Part 1] What were the biggest problems when SETTING UP the grazing scheme?

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
What were the biggest problems you had to deal with when setting up the grazing scheme?								
in priority order, [the biggest problem first (P), followed by the solution (S).	P - convincing grazers that it was viable. S - provision of infrastructure payments & inducements including peppercorn grazing license rents.	P - credibility: most conservationists do not have a clue! S - only if warden skilled in stock should he manage them; better to employ someone, or pay someone to graze.	P - funding of this large grazing scheme between NT & EN. S - joint initiative funded by WES.	P - finding suitable stock [no grazing 91-95]. S - asking enough people.		P - public reaction, although not a statutory common site is well used especially by dog walkers. S - public gradually informed during fence work; notices later; no public meeting.	P - controlling stock. S - electric fence system; one strand 'turbo tape' but worried about durability. (see Table 2.13 [Part 1]).	P - controlling ponies. S - single strand electric tape with unelectrified polywire.
	P - stock control on 'common' land S - not yet found!	P - how many animals, what sort? S - start small in a remote, out of the way part of the reserve and build up and spread as confidence increases.	P - getting the correct stock. S - NT estate for traditional cattle; private owner for ponies.	P - scrub growth of gorse and Bog Myrtle due to no grazing 1983-91. S - scrub removal by hand and machine opening areas for grazing.		P - would like to graze sheep as well as cattle but conflict with dog walkers! S - do not know; get used to cattle first.	P - public acceptance. S - notices to inform; + reassurance re bull!	P - scrub. S - has to be cut out as required.
		P - stock handling and no holding pen at start. S - use same staff daily; have a corral from day one and a means of getting animals to it! [nut bribery].	P - getting the correct stocking rate. S - experience from New Forest & trial and error.			P - getting the fence erected [Countryside Stewardship only paid for materials]. S - erected over several months using project staff and volunteers.		
		P - stock control and handling. S - do not involve amateurs - can be counter productive.						

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2. 12 [Part 2] What were the biggest problems when SETTING UP the grazing scheme?

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Upgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
What were the biggest problems you had to deal with when setting up the grazing scheme?								
in priority order, [the biggest problem first (P), followed by the solution (S)].	P - enclosure of 100 acres. S - allowed under provisions of Ashdown Forest Act.	P - funding. S - various: max use of vols & Govt Scheme staff; sales of heath products; more private/corp sponsors; continued support of all Bodies involved in Sandlings Group.	P - keeping them in! S - permanent fencing & with the flock not able to see any 'grass' fields as temptation.	P - cost of fencing the area. S - £3k funds obtained.	P - no water to the site. S - borehole, c 2 km of pipe to a 2,200 litre storage tank feeding 4 troughs. [Cost £6k+].	P - transport [4 x 4 & trailer]. S - borrowed initially, then purchase of second hand trailer.	P - finding a suitable breed. S - Hebridean sheep [after experimentation with other hill breeds (Swalesdale etc)].	P - funding of costs. S - Wildlife Enhancement Scheme.
	P - overwintering cattle jumped fences to get better feed. S - stock no longer winter grazed after Oct.	P - sheep straying through electric fences. S - permanent fencing funded by CoCo. Stewardship	P - funding. S - on going problem. [So far, as one source of funds has disappeared another arrives. Attempting to maximise efficiency & sales of heath products to reduce costs].	P - fencing of area which had previously had open access. S - withstood initial objections which have now passed.	P - site not fully fenced. S - erection of boundary and internal fencing. [Cost £8k].	P - checking stock on remote sites. S - not solved, staff & volunteers take turns. Would be best to pay someone.	P - finding winter grazing when taken off heath. S - put on chalk grassland SSSI's.	P - public perception of fencing on registered common land. S - public meeting / press / articles in Parish Magazine. [There is still a lot of resentment].
	P - no real control over stocking rates so some under grazing. S - none, unless become stock holders but benefits outweighed by disadvantages.	P - moving 'flying flock' stock frequently. S - own LR and stock trailer funded by EN.	P - fencing Common. S - follow legal procedures or use temporary inclosures [but then containment problems!].		P - Bracken infestation on c146ha. S - commenced bracken control programme 1984 onwards. [Cost £10k+].	P - wintering ground in bad weather. [So far stock have kept moving on to fresh grazing but bad weather could cause problems]. S - need holding ground.	P - cost of establishment and running. S - funds from sponsorship schemes & support from EN & WWF.	
		P - winter grazing for stock. S - go to grassland marsh reserves when need to be off heath + local sympathetic land owners; rent additional grass; bought additional land.						

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2.13 [Part 1] What are the biggest problems you are facing NOW?

Site name	Goss & Tregoss Moors	Aylesbeare & Harpford Commons	Hartland Moor	Stoborough Heath	The New Forest	Brookwood Heath	The Flashes, Frensham	Prey Heath
What are the biggest problems you are facing now?								
in priority order, [the biggest problem first (P), followed by the solution (S).	P - lack of mixed grazing [want cattle + sheep + ponies] S - improve boundary fencing; encourage breed diversity by one-off payments to set up other stock & hence demonstrate viability to other grazers.	P - continuity. S - better to have a local farmer even if timing or number not ideal. Decision to be taken by the warden, not a committee.	P - grazier has to make herd pay; switching out of dairy into beef. S - building up herd over 5 years.	P - creating ideal mosaic of vegetation for Wartbiters. S - adjusting grazing regime according to the growing season.	P - decline of commoning. S - need for financial support schemes e.g. filly premium scheme.	P - want to graze with sheep as well as cattle but conflict with dog walkers. S - not known yet!	P - grazier wants animals on back-up land longer away from heath! S - as stock number rise should be on heath longer anyway.	P - part of the site is privately owned giving some uncertainty of future management. S - ?
		P - do not look for profit. S - assume a loss making venture, then minimise loss by keeping costs down.	P - monitoring scheme. S - contract & using students.		P - unfettered recreation S - zoning areas for visitor use; charging for car parking; stricter controls.		P - 'tape' burning out in sections. S - keep repairing it.	
		P - time commitment. S - budget for up to 2 hours daily, and need for helpers.					P - control of grazing periods. S - continual nagging of graziers!	

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

Table 2. 13 [part 2] What are the biggest problems you are facing NOW?

Site name	Ashdown Forest	Sutton Common	Upper Hollesley Common	Cavenham Heath	Brettenham Heath	Swannington Upgate Common	Skipwith Common [1]	Skipwith Common [2]
What are the biggest problems you are facing now?								
in priority order, [the biggest problem first (P), followed by the solution (S)].	P - need to extend grazed area to over 400 ha but severe resistance to fencing Common land. S - application to DoE approved in 1996; two year process being completed in 1998.	P - somewhere to lamb as flock increase. S - hopefully arrangements with other conservation bodies locally; also new lambing barn.	P - funding. S - cooperation with other conservation bodies locally to produce an economy of scale for the whole flock.	P - grass growth variability in dry / wet periods makes difficulty in getting stocking rate correct. S - no solution except flexibility of stock numbers during the season.	P - variability of grass growth in dry / wet periods makes it difficult to get stocking rate correct. S - no solution except flexibility of stock numbers during the season.	P - snow can make fencing ineffective & need for food. S - need holding ground with good fencing & accessibility.	P - financial support. S - look to EN.	P - wish to extend the grazing to the whole site - 270ha of common land. S - cannot use Hebridean sheep because of the numbers of loose dogs and heavily wooded nature of most of the area. So, are going to try Exmoor pony herd and feral goats.
	P - provision of stock for larger area without relying on one commoner grazer. S - encourage other commoners; a commoner co-operative; contract grazing; own stock; all liaising within a grazing committee to be set up to agree the ground rules and work together.	P - sufficient summer / winter grazing [chicken & egg cycle of above problems]. S - full cooperation with other local heath owners especially EN, RSPB, NT.		P - conflict with farmer over high rabbit numbers which are good for Stone Curlews. S - rent may be reduced when rabbit numbers high.	P - conflict between farmer needing to get maximum financial return [hence does not use best breed of grazing sheep] & the conservation objectives. S - No easy answer!	P - as flock size increases so does the number of movements. S - divide flock up to sites - but increases stock inspections to each site.	P - maintenance of fencing. S - look to EN.	P - no money to buy stock. S - ? a grant?
	P - bracken not being controlled by grazing. S - forage harvesting to remove top; reduce grazing period to allow spraying.	P - funding. S - as above.				P - shepherds half - time hours is not sufficient. S - full time or employ additional staff.	P - people expect instant results. S - none, improvements are slow but will come within a decade.	P - catching of animals in event of injury, stock tasks etc. S - remove most of the trees.

Key to Tables: Empty box - indicates no information supplied or not available. n/a - not applicable. c - approximately. C - cattle; S - sheep; P - ponies.

## 5. Discussion and policy implications

Several of the case study authors were anxious to emphasise to readers of this Report that the grazing scheme they were running and as described by them should not be assumed to be 'best practice' examples, but more realistically that they should be read as their efforts to work towards improving their grazing scheme[s] so that in due course they will have a grazing scheme of which they can be proud. Many of the schemes came into existence through recognition of the desperate need to somehow get grazing started, even if the grazing animals or the grazing intensity would need to be adjusted in future years and the Site Summaries adequately convey this process of continual improvement and refinement. There is mixed advice given by different authors between those that suggest starting grazing and dealing with problems as they arise, and those that urge slightly more caution before getting animals on to site. A middle of the road approach is probably justified and perhaps the setting out of the main problems experienced by these authors will help new scheme managers anticipate and therefore prepare for the likely problems without extensive delay in starting grazing.

The problems encountered at the time of setting up these grazing schemes are well described in Table 2.12 [both Parts 1 and Part 2]. These are summarised in Table 3.1.

Once schemes are up and running there is a need for constant inputs to deal with problems that inevitably arise, and in order to action extensions to what may be pilot grazing schemes. The most commonly occurring problems currently requiring the attention of scheme managers are well described in Table 2.13 [both Parts 1 and Part 2]. These are summarised in Table 3.2.

### Policy implications

It can be seen from the above summaries that for those thinking of setting up a grazing scheme the largest initial concerns are ensuring that financial resources become available for the provision of infrastructure requirements, especially for scrub removal, fencing and a water supply where necessary. On many sites with public access, especially 'common' land sites, obtaining public support and approval for fencing and stock grazing can be a big hurdle to overcome. Thereafter obtaining stock and looking after it become the main issue. Managers diverge into two very clear preferences at this point. Those that are legally required or consider it important to work with commoners, local grazers or farmers to supply and manage stock, whilst at the same time reducing the burden on conservation staff of carrying out stock tasks. These schemes have to develop excellent working relationships with their graziers if conservation grazing objectives are to be met. By comparison there are those who need to have their own stock fully under their complete control in order to obtain the desired grazing. These schemes accept the additional responsibility of obtaining resources for the daily stock inspections and stock tasks. The choice of which route to follow has to be taken locally according to the legal situation, local politics, resources available and the level of compliance required with conservation objectives. It would appear important to help grazing managers to improve their networking with each other, to assist discussion of these issues, and to improve information availability especially in respect of attributes of breeds of grazing animals on heathland sites. It is hoped that the Grazing Animals Project [GAP] now getting under way may assist this process.

One of the major policy implications that emerges from this Report is that although resource requirements vary enormously from site to site depending on the large

number of variables that may or may not affect each site, (see Table 2) few if any lowland heathland grazing schemes can be self supporting and therefore require injection of financial resources from one source or other. Currently, scheme managers spend a large amount of time trying to find these resources and are often uncertain where they will be obtained in future years. Extensions to current heathland grazing schemes may be held back due to this uncertainty. A large amount of progress has been made in the last few years to implement more grazing on heathlands. The interest and momentum that has been generated now needs to be consolidated so that grazing scheme managers can plan realistically for the future. With the ending of English Nature's Lowland Heathland Programme in March 1998 key issues for future lowland heathland conservation have been identified in Michael (1997) and it will be essential for the 'lowland heathland habitat action plan under the *Biodiversity Action Plan* and *Tomorrows Heathland Heritage Lottery Project* to continue the 'grazing' momentum. Section 3, paragraph 5 of that Report, presents a good summary of the economic issues to be addressed.

Table 3.1. Summary of Problems encountered by these sixteen grazing schemes at 'START-UP'.

Problems [at these 16 sites]	Number of Occurrences	Solutions suggested by authors	Policy implications
<p>Convincing others of viability of grazing scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● financial viability</li> <li>● credibility of 'conservation' scheme</li> </ul>	<p>7</p> <p>1</p>	<p>provision of financial inducements; peppercorn rents; funds from agri-environment schemes [CSS, WES] for infrastructure [water, fencing, stock pen etc] and guaranteed into future; use of volunteers; sale of produce; sponsorship</p> <p>provision of infrastructure; persuasion of grazer</p>	<p>reliable sources of funds [e.g. THHLP, WES]; and support [BAPLHHAP];</p> <p>resource provision</p>
Obtaining approval of public and visitors	4	provision of information to 'sell' the idea; followed by notice boards; want sheep grazing but having to start with cattle because of dog worrying	continue public education & provision of information
Obtaining approval to fence common land	4	special approval required under Section 194 Law of Property Act 1925 from DETR Bristol; may be public meeting and public enquiry	commons legislation?; voluntary consensus building approach
Scrub and bracken removal and control prior to starting grazing	2	scrub/bracken removal [labour/expense]	resource provision
Finding suitable stock	3	asking around; start small; experimentation	grazing network (e.g.GAP)
<p>Stock control and management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● provision of boundary fencing</li> <li>● provision of handling facilities</li> <li>● availability of stockman</li> <li>● stock trailer</li> <li>● supply of water</li> <li>● availability of winter lay-back grazing</li> <li>● over/under grazing</li> </ul>	<p>4</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>3</p> <p>1</p>	<p>permanent fencing; [electric fencing as temporary solution only]</p> <p>need stock pen from start</p> <p>obtain services of stockman [do not use amateurs]; daily inspections</p> <p>borrow; purchase second hand</p> <p>natural sources; mains; bore hole supply</p> <p>lay-back land needed; put on chalk grassland/marsh sites</p> <p>cooperation of grazier; incentives; own stock</p>	<p>resource provision</p> <p>resource provision</p> <p>resource provision</p> <p>resource provision</p> <p>resource provision</p> <p>grazing network</p> <p>local liaison/resource provision</p>

Table 3.2. Summary of Problems STILL BEING ENCOUNTERED on these sixteen sites

Problems [at these 16 sites]	Number of occurrences	Solutions suggested by authors	Policy implications
Financial resources:			
● non profit making	1	? [trying to keep costs down]	reliable sources of funds [e.g. THHLP, WES]; and support [BAPLHHAP]
● future funding	6	? [help needed!]	
Stock control and management:			
● excessive use of lay-back land	1	?	resource provision resource provision resource provision/local liaison network/local liaison local liaison new technology
● durability of fencing/electric fencing	2	? [high repair/replacement costs]; make fencing permanent	
● stockman costs	3	finance required	
● lambing barn as flock increases	1	finance for new barn + help from volunteers	
● over/under grazing	3	help from nearby conservation bodies; requires cooperation of grazer	
● winter lay-back land in snow	1	provision of lay-back land	
● finding the animals for daily inspections	1	remove most of the trees or develop animal tracker system	
Decline of commoning	1	need for financial support schemes; voluntary consensus building approach	commons legislation; consensus building guidelines
Finding suitable stock; and ensuring continuity of supply	3	mixed cattle, sheep, pony grazing requires one-off payments to encourage graziers to diversify stock type; local farmer an advantage; one local farmer uses 'soft' sheep as they are more marketable -? solution	resource provision; network
Public access:			
● recreation and sheep worrying	2	?	education/consensus building
● expectations of instant results	1	explain it takes time	education
Extension to grazed area	4	one scheme enabled by new WES; one scheme changing to ponies to overcome public access problems with sheep; one scheme looking to diversify source of stock supply	resource provision; agri-environment schemes
Obtaining approval to fence common land for extension of grazing	1	special approval required, at least two year process [special approval required under Section 194 Law of Property Act 1925 from DETR Bristol; may be public meeting and public enquiry]	common land policy
Bracken not being controlled by grazing	1	manual cutting or spraying interferes with grazing	grazing network; advice



## 6. References

- GIMINGHAM, C.H. 1992. The lowland heathland management handbook. *English Nature Science*, No 8. ISBN 1 85716 0770.
- MICHAEL, N. 1993. The lowland heathland management handbook version 1.0, *English Nature Science series*, No 11. ISBN 1 85716 086 X.
- TUBBS, C. R. 1986. The New Forest. *New Naturalist Series*. Collins ISBN 0002191075. Due to be published with updates in 1998.
- PUTNAM, R.J., PRATT, R.M., EKINS, J.R., EDWARDS, P.J. 1987. Food and feeding behaviour of cattle and ponies in the New Forest Hampshire. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 24: 369 -380.
- MICHAEL, N. 1997. *Key future issues in lowland heathland conservation*. National Lowland Heathland Programme. Peterborough: English Nature.